

**From:** Emily Kahoe Chen  
**To:** [school.board@apsva.us](mailto:school.board@apsva.us); [engage@apsva.us](mailto:engage@apsva.us); [lisa.stengle@apsva.us](mailto:lisa.stengle@apsva.us); [gladis.bourdouane@apsva.us](mailto:gladis.bourdouane@apsva.us)  
**Subject:** Alternative proposal for Elementary School Boundary Process  
**Date:** Thursday, December 5, 2019 11:06:21 PM  
**Attachments:** [AlternativeAPSScenario.xlsx](#)

---

Dear APS Planning Staff,

I have developed an alternative scenario to address the elementary school capacity issue that does not move option schools, moves towards more balanced capacity, and attains significant gains in number of students who are zoned to a school within walking distance.

The attached excel document contains the list of planning units by proposed elementary school assignment in the first tab, and a summary of the characteristics of this scenario in the second tab. In brief, APS could attain an increase of 660 walkers and balance utilization (only 5 of 20 neighborhood schools with a capacity of less than 80% and no schools over 103%) through boundary changes only. These boundary changes would involve only 1997 students changing schools (15% of all students; this includes students moving to Reed).

The scenario assumes that option schools remain as-is. I also did not fully adjust boundaries in South Arlington because I am less familiar with these neighborhoods, including which areas are likely to grow the fastest.

I appreciate the level of detailed data you have made available to the public, and I hope that these types of “crowd sourced” ideas can be incorporated into your stakeholder engagement activities and ultimate decision-making processes.

I kindly request a response regarding APS’ review of this scenario. I am available to furnish additional analyses or answer questions if that would be helpful.

In light of the type of alternative I am presenting, I think it is disingenuous to continue referring to the "Representative Boundary Scenario" as the only alternative to moving school locations, and I would like to see APS recognize the potential for boundary-only changes as a stop-gap measure until new elementary seats can be established through school renovation or construction.

Respectfully,  
Emily Chen

	No. Students				Permanent Capacity 2019-20
	Total	Bus Eligible	Walker	% Walker	
<b>NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS</b>	<b>10549</b>	<b>5723</b>	<b>4826</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>12129</b>
Fleet	473	58	415	88%	752
Abingdon	750	512	238	32%	725
ASFS	559	460	99	18%	553
Ashlawn	610	445	165	27%	684
Barcroft	444	227	217	49%	460
Barrett	495	70	425	86%	576
Carlin Springs	566	538	28	5%	585
Discovery	548	356	192	35%	630
Drew Model	449	203	246	55%	674
Glebe	464	0	464	100%	510
Hoffman-Boston	425	299	126	30%	566
Jamestown	544	452	92	17%	597
Long Branch	546	431	115	21%	533
McKinley	691	464	227	33%	684
Nottingham	443	118	325	73%	513
Oakridge	558	220	338	61%	674
Randolph	384	0	384	100%	484
Reed	575	182	393	68%	725
Taylor	570	442	128	22%	659
Tuckahoe	455	246	209	46%	545

**\*\* This alternative representative boundary scenario would result in 1997 students changing schools (including Reed students), all students.**

Cap. Util.	net walker change
<b>87%</b>	660
63%	9
103%	12
101%	70
89%	-45
97%	14
86%	12
97%	6
87%	4
67%	30
91%	12
75%	7
91%	1
102%	1
101%	3
86%	-11
83%	17
79%	18
79%	393
86%	-27
83%	134

ould involve  
, or 15% of